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# 1NC

The aff must prove that affirming the principle stated by the resolution is better justified than negating it. But there are different kinds of justification. Most reasons for accepting a principle have to do with epistemic evidence for the principle’s truth, but we can also have pragmatic reasons for belief. Jordan:

Jeff Jordan, [Professor of Philosophy at the University of Delaware],  "Pragmatic Arguments and Belief in God", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2011 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2011/entries/pragmatic-belief-god/>. JMN

As with so much in philosophy, the first recorded employment of a pragmatic argument is found in Plato. At *Meno* 86b-c, Socrates tells Meno that believing in the value of inquiry is justified because of the positive impact upon one's character: Meno: Somehow or other I believe you are right. Socrates: I think I am. I shouldn't like to take my oath on the whole story, but one thing I am ready to fight for as long as I can, in word and act—that is, that we shall be better, braver, and more active men if we believe it right to look for what we don't know than if we believe there is no point in looking because what we don't know we can never discover. Meno: There too I am sure you are.[[1](http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/pragmatic-belief-god/notes.html" \l "1)] Paraphrased, Socrates' point is if being better, braver, and more active are among our desires, and if believing that inquiry is permissible facilitates our becoming better, braver, and more active, then we have reason, pragmatic reason, to believe that inquiry is permissible. Socrates' argument is an argument for the permissibility of a certain belief, based on the benefits of believing that certain belief. Pragmatic arguments are practical in orientation, justifying actions that are thought to facilitate the achievement of our goals, or the satisfaction of our desires. If among your goals is A, and if doing such and such results in your achieving A, then, all else being equal, you have reason to do such and such: Doing α brings about, or contributes in bringing about, β, and It is in your interest that β obtain. So, you have reason to do α. As presented this is a particular kind of pragmatic argument, a prudential argument. Prudential pragmatic arguments are predicated upon one's preferences or goals or self-interest. As we will see, there are pragmatic arguments that are not narrowly prudential but are moral in nature. Pragmatic arguments are relevant to belief-formation, since inculcating a belief is an action. There are, broadly speaking, two kinds of pragmatic arguments that have to do with belief-formation. The first is an argument that recommends taking steps to believe a proposition because, if it should turn out to be true, the benefits gained from believing that proposition will be impressive. This first kind of pragmatic argument we can call a “truth-dependent” pragmatic argument, or more conveniently a “dependent-argument,” since the benefits are obtained only if the relevant state of affairs occurs. The prime example of a dependent-argument is a pragmatic argument that uses a calculation of expected utility and employs the Expectation Rule to recommend belief: whenever both probability and utility values are known, one should choose to do an act which has the greatest expected utility. Among the various versions of his wager argument, Pascal employs this Rule in a version which states that no matter how small the probability that God exists, as long as it is a positive, non-zero probability, the expected utility of theistic belief will dominate the expected utility of disbelief. Given the distinction between (A) having reason to think a certain proposition is true, and (B) having reason to induce belief in that proposition, taking steps to generate belief in a certain proposition may be the rational thing to do, even if that proposition lacks sufficient evidential support. The benefits of believing a proposition can rationally take precedence over the evidential strength enjoyed by a contrary proposition; and so, given an infinite expected utility, Pascal's Wager contends that forming the belief that God exists is the rational thing to do, no matter how small the likelihood that God exists.

Those pragmatic reasons can be about the consequences of our beliefs but also about the language used to state them. Representations of our language affect our ability to act effectively and interact with others. Haste writes:

Helen Haste, [PhD of Psychology at the University of Bath], “Communitarianism and the Social Construction of Morality”, 1998. NC

Communitarian thinkersstart from a very different psychological tradition. They emphasise the **primacy of language and social interaction in the generation of meaning [is important]**. Taylor argues that **human life is ‘fundamentally dialogic …. We become full human agents, capable of understanding ourselves, and hence defining an identity, through our acquisition of rich human languages of expression.**’ (1991 p 32). This aligns the communitarian ontological position with social constructionists like John Shotter (1993) and Rom HarrZ (HarrZ and Gillett, 1994) who argue that the primary human reality is face-to-face conversation. **If social interaction is the crucible of meaning, then the child learns about morality through discourse and through social practices**, both explicit and implicit. **The ‘meaning’ of something – including the meaning of our own identity and our morality – depends on what is comprehensible and recognized within our social community. Social beings create their identity through shared discourse and language** (Shotter, 1993). Communities are multiple; we are members of many communities which each offer us identity, and personal meaning, and within each different elements and skills are salient. Cultural narratives, stories and traditions feed directly into our identity, signaling valued attributes and behaviours, and giving an explanation for our past and present. Crucially, we also recognize that these are shared by those whom we thus define as members of our community. A moral obligation can only have meaning within a social context. Richard Shweder describes taboos and practices found amongst rural Hindus in India which are quite morally meaningless to Americans, because they are associated with beliefs about pollution which are not shared (Shweder et al, 1987). However practices may be widely condemned, but for different reasons – believing that rape is wrong because it defiles the victim’s purity, is very different from seeing it as wrong because treats her as an object rather than a person.

This is empirically proven- the language associated with domestic violence is crucial to solve abuse and ensure victims are protected. Fountain et al:

Kim Fountain et al [PH.D, Deputy Director New York City Anti-Violence Project], "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer Domestic violence in the united states in 2008" The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs www.avp.org/documents/2008NCAVPLGBTQDVReportFINAL.pdf FD

Definitions are important because without a clear understanding of what domestic violence is, it can be difficult for survivors to determine if they are experiencing domestic violence. **Providers who do not share a definition of domestic violence may refuse to recognize this violence in LGBTQ relationships and opt to deny services**. Further, **without a nuanced understanding of the unique aspects of LGBTQ domestic violence, providers may choose to adopt a „one size fits all‟ mentality where they claim to deliver services to all equally when LGBTQ survivors are not actually receiving culturally competent or equal services**. Despite dilemmas regarding **definitions**, they **are important as they help to frame and name acts of violence and to hold perpetrators of such violence accountable**.

The counter-advocacy is that its morally permissible for victims to use deadly force as a deliberate response to repeated intimate partner violence.

First, the term “domestic” creates hetero-normative tendencies excluding LGBT victims--- the domestic violence laws in California proves. Fountain 2:

Kim Fountain et al [PH.D, Deputy Director New York City Anti-Violence Project], "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer Domestic violence in the united states in 2008" The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs www.avp.org/documents/2008NCAVPLGBTQDVReportFINAL.pdf FD

―Intimate Partner Violence‖ and ―Domestic Violence‖ - Distinctions Between the Terms Use of the term “domestic violence” to describe violence in LGBTQ intimate relationships has been disfavored by some feminist researchers. They contend that **the language of “domesticity” reflects the patriarchy and hetero-normative tendencies of the law from which it springs, obscuring the dimensions of gender and power at play. These tendencies have various expressions in state law, but even those with provisions around LGBTQ intimate partnerships tend exhibit some form of sanctioned discrimination in either text or practice**. For example, **in order to access a legal remedy under California‟s Domestic Violence Protection Act** (“DVPA”), **one must fall into one of the Act‟s categories of “protected persons,” as well as demonstrate, to the Court‟s satisfaction, “reasonable proof of a past act or acts of abuse.”** Categories of “protected persons” under the Act include being the Spouse, Cohabitant, Co-parent, Child, or Blood relative to the alleged perpetrator, or sharing a Dating or Engagement Relationship with the alleged perpetrator. Thus, there is no conduct which alone is sufficient to satisfy the extension of domestic civil protection orders; whatever proofs the alleged victim provides of a past act (or acts) of abuse by the alleged perpetrator, no protection order will be granted without establishing also that the relationship between the alleged victim and the alleged perpetrator is one which the Act anticipated in crafting the law.

That turns case because LGBTQ intimate partnerships are excluded from the law, so they aren’t protected, increasing discriminatory abuse.

Second, the term “domestic” justifies continued violence against the victim because it “domesticizes” the private sphere, which makes the abuse immune from the law. Rivera:

Jenny Rivera [Professor of Law at the City University of New York] Violence Against Women Act and the Construction of Multiple Consciousness in the Civil Rights and Feminist Movement,”, 1995. FD

Violence against women by intimate partners is commonly referred to as “domestic violence.” In previous articles, I have voiced my opposition to the use of **the word “domestic” as a qualifier for this category of violence** because it **characterizes violence against women** by current and former spouces and lovers **as** **sufficiently distinct from all other forms of violence** so **as to justify** wholly different, sometimes, **inadequate**, **sanctioning of such violence**. See Jenny Rivera, Domestic Violence Against Latinas by Latino Males: An Analysis of Race, National Origin, and Gender Differentials, 14 B.C. Third World L.J.231, 232 n.5 (1994) [hereinafter domestic Violene against Latinas]; Jenny Rivera, Puerto Rico’s Domestic Violence Prevention and Intervention Law and the United States Violence Against Women Act of 1994: The Limitations of Legislative Responses, 5 Colum. J. Gender & L. 78, 79 n.8 (1995) [hereinafter Puerto Rico’s Domestic Violence Law]. Undeniably, violence against women by these categories of perpretrators is different from other violence crimes commited by strangers or nonintimate acquantances and relatives. However, **the use of “domestic” as a qualifying term does more than simply categorize based on the status of the abuser. This terminology has**, in effect, **“domesticized” the very act of violence and** **facilitated the insulation of this violence from public scrutiny and criminalized**. See Elizabeth M. Schneider, The Violence of Privacy, 24 CONN. L. Rev. 973, 977 (1991) (“**thus, in the so-called private sphere of domestic and family life, which is purportedly immune from law, there is always the selective application of law**. Signifincantly**, the selective application of law invokes ‘privacy’ a a rationalte for immunity in order to protect male domination**.”)

TURNS case because the aff’s rhetoric entrenches the public/private dichotomy allowing for continued abuse.

The public/private sphere dichotomy is awful. Justifies things like the Virginia Tech shooting and other school shootings. Angela Battery explains:

Angela j. hattery “intimate partner violenc”

**On april 16, 2007 the worst school shooting in the history of the united states – to date – took place when a gunman shot thirty-two members of the Virginia tech university campus** community before turning the gun on himself and becoming the third third “victim”. Early speculation about the motive focused on a possible domestic dispute. Perhaps the most troubling aspect of this situation is the fact that many accounts of the morning of april 16, 2007, indicate that **[Virginia Tech’s] the campus police did not immediately recognize the risk that the shooter presented to the entire Virginia tech campus because the first homicide committed that morning was believed to be a domestic violence homicide**. **Virginia tech president Charles steger said authorities believed that the shooting at the dorm was a domestic dispute and mistakenly thought the gunman had fled the campus**. **We had no reason to suspect any other incident was going to occur he said.** **The events surrounding the Virginia tech shooting are troubling for many reasons, first and foremost because the decision by the Virginia tech president implies that domestic violence homicide is nothing to take too seriously, and certainly it does not constitute a threat to public safety in the larger community**. And yet **in many cases of domestic violence homicide, other victims are maimed and or murdered**. **Even more troubling is the fact that in examining other school shootings, a clear and disturbing pattern emerges. Beginning with the texas tower shootings at the university of texas, Austin, in 1966, many school shootings either began with or involved domestic violence homicide**. In the texas tower shootings, the shooter, Charles Whitman, murdered his wife and his mother the night before the terrible rampage in Austin. **Luke woodham, the school shooter in pearl, missipppiip, also began his rampge by shooting his girlfriend and mother**. And, of course, the most recent tragedy at Virginia tech as believed to begin with a domestic violence homicide. In all of these cases, had law enforcement and meergecny responders taken the initla domestic violence homicide as a matter obf public safety, perhaps the greater targedies would have been avoided.

Third, the term “domestic violence” disguises the criminal nature of the violence. Only the term intimate partner violence solves. Douglas -

Heather Douglas “Crime in the intimate sphere: prosecutions of intimate partner violence” 7 newscastle l. rev 80 (2004)

In this paper I have eschewed the use of **the term ‘domestic violence’**, this term has suffered criticism in recent times. It has been suggested that the use of the term ultimately **hampers further enquiry as it denotes a status relationship as well as a special one, separate such violence out from and somehow modifying ordinary violence**. Others note that although **the term**, when it was initially contrived, was both radical and useful, it may now work to **trivialize[s] the violence which broadly is occurring in the context of the home**. One judge recently noted that he disliked the term ‘domestic violence’ because **the term disguised its criminal nature**. It is thus difficult to know how to appropriately name the violence that is the subject of this paper. **Its relationship context and gendered nature is extremely relevant** and important **to understanding and dealing with it**. Rather than trivializing it, its status should be seen to exacerbate its seriousness, it is separate from other violence, it is worse. **This type of violence is** worse and **more serious than many other forms of violence because its perpetrators exploit the intimate knowledge they have of their victim** and because it frequently exploits a power imbalance between the parties. **As a result of these considerations I have used** **the term ‘intimate partner violence’** to **denote[s]** that **violence which takes place between those in** defacto or marriage relationships or those formerly in such **relationships**. Previous research has found that most DVOs are applied for by women against their male intimates or previous intimates (rather than by men against women). This research supports the view that violence against women by men in intimate relationships is more likely to occur and generally more serious than violence against men by women. The violence discussed here is very much about gender and relationship and this is played out in the fact scenarios I will discuss below. The reality for women continues to be that they are more likely to suffer violence from their intimate partner (or previous partner) than any other person.

FInally, any risk of using the word “domestic violence” destroys discourse. Louise:

Mary Louise, journalist with the *London Morning Paper*, 4 (http://www.newswithviews.com/guest\_opinion/guest32.htm)

**Doublethink**, or reality control, **involves being aware of truthfulness, while at the same time professing carefully devised lies and believing both**, as our so-called leaders aptly demonstrate. **Political language is designed to make lies sound truthful, and to convey the opposite of actual intentions, in order to greatly influence public opinion**. Politically correct **terminology is the invention of a simplified new vocabulary that masks**, distorts, and alters the **true meanings of traditional definitions**. **It limits the range of ideas and emotions that are allowed to be expressed, and causes unnecessary confusion and conflict that restricts understanding, which makes it difficult to communicate rationally and effectively**. Control of language and information is necessary to condition citizens to love their oppressors, appreciate censorship, and tolerate brutality. Freedom is slavery, war is peace, and ignorance is strength. As George Washington said, "In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened." In the words of George Orwell..."Doublethink means the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them." "1984" is his most famous work, in which a surveillant State enforces conformity through constant indoctrination, fear, lies, and punishment. It was out of the chaos of wars that the Party seized control. This novel introduced the concept of Big Brother and Newspeak, the fictional language that is supposed to eclipse Oldspeak (the existing English language), by the year 2050. The notion was to remove politically incorrect ideas in a vocabulary of dichotomies, euphemisms, and abbreviations. By doing so, making nonconformist thoughts a crime and free speech impossible, in a dreary Totalitarian State, where people cannot resist tyranny, and will surrender liberty for security. Not actually used in the book, "doublespeak" is related to "doubletalk" and the apparent combination of doublethink and newspeak. According to Orwell, "Thoughtcrime is the essential crime that contains all others in itself." The Orwellian concept of crimethink means to doubt the principles of Ingsoc, or even consider any thought that questions official state policy. Ingsoc, or English Socialism, is basically a modern political system of Oligarchical Collectivism, that reflects Stalinism with Machiavellian overtones. "Hate Crime" legislation fits right in with the Orwellian scenario, as the thought police patrol our neighborhoods.

This means that the use of deadly force in response to repeated domestic violence is permissible if and only if we refer to the situation as “intimate partner violence” and not “domestic violence”. This alternative principle solves 100% of the AFF offense as we permit the same action as the AFF except refer to the situation they are in as “intimate partner violence”. Given that the actions of both advocacies are indistinguishable, any risk of a net benefit, i.e. a reason why using the word “domestic violence” is bad, is a reason to negate.

And, if the alternative solves 100% of the AFF, you should vote on a net benefit even if it doesn’t link to a standard because [A] it becomes literally the only unique offense in the debate! You would have nothing else to vote on, and [B] every conception of morality would agree, holding all else equal, that perpetuating the abuse is bad. To get rid of the net benefit, they need to generate offense through a link or impact turn.

Finally, the discourse argument functions as both a link and an impact. It’s a link because it means language counts as a source of pragmatic reasons for belief, so my advocacy is competitive by net benefits. But it’s also a pre-fiat reason to negate: if language shapes reality, then you should reject the resolution’s language because this is the only real-world impact in the round. LD is a meaningful activity because it teaches us how to reason about values in public affairs, so vote neg because the aff contributes to a harmful way of framing domestic violence in public discussion, just as you should vote against debaters who use racial epithets.

# \*\*Frontlines\*\*

# Alternative Solvency

The term intimate partner includes same sex couples. CDC

http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/intimatepartnerviolence/definitions.html

Intimate partner violence (IPV) is a serious, preventable public health problem that affects millions of Americans. **The term "intimate partner violence"** describes physical, sexual, or psychological harm by a current or former partner or spouse. This type of violence **can occur among heterosexual or same-sex couples and does not require sexual intimacy**.

# 2NR

The role of the ballot is to question the affirmative’s rhetorical choices prefer my link evidence

A) Comparative – despite the general tendency to underestimate the significance of what is said by claiming it’s mere rhetoric, interrogation of words is essential b/c it determines our ability to communicate effectively with others. That is the starting point of our ability to reason effectively and be good decision makers.

B) Specificity – only my evidence assumes the importance of analyzing the affirmative’s rhetorical choices when terms are vague and ambiguous.

C) You should have a higher credence in my arguments --- my evidence isolates empirical and analytical warrants. That’s the fountain and Rivera evidence. This means I have the strongest and most unique link to the discourse impact – using the word domestic violence will negatively affect the ability of everyone to communicate effectively.

D) Conclusive – Failure to examine the use of the word domestic violence entrenches the public/private sphere dichotomy, creating a cycle of violence immuning the act from law.

And, prefer the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ ev over their undeveloped analytics.

NOW IT’S TIME FOR IMPACT COMPARISON.

Discourse impact comes first. – Hold them to the \_\_\_\_ analytics they made to the haste ev in the 1AR. NO NEW ARGUMENTS.

Prefer specificity --- all my impact cards are unique reasons why focusing on the definition of domestic violence is crucial to solving abuse.

Extend Rivera – “Domestic” domesticizes the situation reentrenching the public/private dichotomy immuning the act from law, invoking a privacy rationale to maintain male domination in the household. The public/private sphere dichotomy is awful. Justifies things like the Virginia Tech shooting and other school shootings. Angela Battery explains:

Angela j. hattery “intimate partner violenc”

**On april 16, 2007 the worst school shooting in the history of the united states – to date – took place when a gunman shot thirty-two members of the Virginia tech university campus** community before turning the gun on himself and becoming the third third “victim”. Early speculation about the motive focused on a possible domestic dispute. Perhaps the most troubling aspect of this situation is the fact that many accounts of the morning of april 16, 2007, indicate that **[Virginia Tech’s] the campus police did not immediately recognize the risk that the shooter presented to the entire Virginia tech campus because the first homicide committed that morning was believed to be a domestic violence homicide**. **Virginia tech president Charles steger said authorities believed that the shooting at the dorm was a domestic dispute and mistakenly thought the gunman had fled the campus**. **We had no reason to suspect any other incident was going to occur he said.** **The events surrounding the Virginia tech shooting are troubling for many reasons, first and foremost because the decision by the Virginia tech president implies that domestic violence homicide is nothing to take too seriously, and certainly it does not constitute a threat to public safety in the larger community**. And yet **in many cases of domestic violence homicide, other victims are maimed and or murdered**. **Even more troubling is the fact that in examining other school shootings, a clear and disturbing pattern emerges. Beginning with the texas tower shootings at the university of texas, Austin, in 1966, many school shootings either began with or involved domestic violence homicide**. In the texas tower shootings, the shooter, Charles Whitman, murdered his wife and his mother the night before the terrible rampage in Austin. **Luke woodham, the school shooter in pearl, missipppiip, also began his rampge by shooting his girlfriend and mother**. And, of course, the most recent tragedy at Virginia tech as believed to begin with a domestic violence homicide. In all of these cases, had law enforcement and meergecny responders taken the initla domestic violence homicide as a matter obf public safety, perhaps the greater targedies would have been avoided.

Representations of our language affect our ability to act effectively and interact with others. Helen Haste[[1]](#footnote-1) writes:

Communitarian thinkersstart from a very different psychological tradition. They emphasise the **primacy of language and social interaction in the generation of meaning [is important]**. Taylor argues that **human life is ‘fundamentally dialogic …. We become full human agents, capable of understanding ourselves, and hence defining an identity, through our acquisition of rich human languages of expression.**’ (1991 p 32). This aligns the communitarian ontological position with social constructionists like John Shotter (1993) and Rom HarrZ (HarrZ and Gillett, 1994) who argue that the primary human reality is face-to-face conversation. **If social interaction is the crucible of meaning, then the child learns about morality through discourse and through social practices**, both explicit and implicit. **The ‘meaning’ of something – including the meaning of our own identity and our morality – depends on what is comprehensible and recognized within our social community. Social beings create their identity through shared discourse and language** (Shotter, 1993). Communities are multiple; we are members of many communities which each offer us identity, and personal meaning, and within each different elements and skills are salient. **Cultural narratives, stories and traditions feed directly into our identity, signaling valued attributes and behaviours, and giving an explanation for our past and present**. Crucially, we also recognize that these are shared by those whom we thus define as members of our community. **A moral obligation can only have meaning within a social context.** Richard Shweder describes taboos and practices found amongst rural Hindus in India which are quite morally meaningless to Americans, because they are associated with beliefs about pollution which are not shared (Shweder et al, 1987). However practices may be widely condemned, but for different reasons – believing that rape is wrong because it defiles the victim’s purity, is very different from seeing it as wrong because treats her as an object rather than a person.

A] The language associated with Intimate partner violence is more precise compared to domestic violence. --- these definitions are crucial to solve abuse and ensure victims are protected. Fountain et al -

Kim Fountain et al [PH.D, Deputy Director New York City Anti-Violence Project], "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer Domestic violence in the united states in 2008" The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs www.avp.org/documents/2008NCAVPLGBTQDVReportFINAL.pdf FD

Definitions are important because without a clear understanding of what domestic violence is, it can be difficult for survivors to determine if they are experiencing domestic violence. **Providers who do not share a definition of domestic violence may refuse to recognize this violence in LGBTQ relationships and opt to deny services**. Further, **without a nuanced understanding of the unique aspects of LGBTQ domestic violence, providers may choose to adopt a „one size fits all‟ mentality where they claim to deliver services to all equally when LGBTQ survivors are not actually receiving culturally competent or equal services**. Despite dilemmas regarding definitions, **they are important as they help to frame and name acts of violence and to hold perpetrators of such violence accountable**.

B] Naming of domestic violence is dire to public response and conceptualizing violence. Fountain 2 -

Kim Fountain et al [PH.D, Deputy Director New York City Anti-Violence Project], "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer Domestic violence in the united states in 2008" The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs www.avp.org/documents/2008NCAVPLGBTQDVReportFINAL.pdf FD

**The naming of domestic violence is important not only in identifying and claiming the issue to be of serious public importance and thus the target of a public response, but also in the meanings and potential implications of the language used**. For instance, Itzin (2000) suggests that “how violence is conceptualized and defined will determine what is visible and seen and known . . . and what is and is not done about it through policy and practice**”** (p. 357). Similarly, **the ways in which domestic violence is named, even the very terms used, can have specific implications with regard to whose experience is named and whose is not**.

C] This analysis of discourse is a prerequisite to taking any action and accesses your offense- it allows us to actually help victims in need.

Smith and Bell:

Phillipa Smith and Alan Bell [Philippa Smith is a PhD in discourses in national identity at AUT University in New Zealand, Allan Bell is Allan Bell is Professor of Language & Communication and the Director of the Institute of Culture, Discourse & Communication at Auckland University of Technology], “Unraveling the Web of Discourse Analysis” <http://www.aut.ac.nz/resources/research/research_institutes/ccr/sage_proofs_05-devereux-ch-04.pdf>

Foucault’s interest in the power play of specific discourses over society has influenced the postmodern connection between language and social structure (Devereux, 2003). This is echoed by Fairclough when referring to discursive practice contributing not just to the reproduction of society (‘social identities, social relationships, systems of knowledge and belief’), but also to the transformation of society (1992: 65). **Analysis of texts also enables identification of the representation, identity and stereotyping of groups and individuals. It allows for critical analysis, an awareness of persuasive language, and uncovers dominating social powers behind discourses.** Such critical analysis **[this] might not solve problems**, **but** it **is a prerequisite that has the ability to identify and analyze situations, and perhaps suggest ways of alleviating or resolving them** (Fairclough et al., 2004). The New Zealand Government, for example, recognized that promotional texts used by tobacco companies carried tempting lifestyle messages to influence, particularly, young people’s behaviour and their attitudes towards smoking. As a result, tobacco and advertising sponsorships were banned in the 1990s (Health NZ, 2005). A burgeoning of text types in society, largely brought about through developing technologies, compels researchers to seek understanding of social reality through analyzing the discourse of the texts and questioning them. Legal documents, advertisements, political and Government papers, company newsletters, propaganda leaflets, articles in newspapers, magazines, and books, television, radio and film, music and lyrics, performing arts and more recently the Internet, mobile phones, mobile television and computer games: these are just some examples of the proliferation of texts. Added to this are the changing and merging of existing discourses through processes of globalization of discourses and discourse genres (Fairclough, 2001).

D) Representations of our language affect our ability to act effectively, have goals and values, and generate positive norms. Haste[[2]](#footnote-2)

My message has been that we must conceptually separate out issues of values from issues of psychological processes; **it is not enough to have a set of values, we must understand how they can most effectively be inculcated.** For moral education to succeed **we must start not with the telos of values, but with recognising how we conceptualise the processes into which we wish to intervene**. Unfortunately, moral education curricula tend to reflect an eclectic, essentially commonsense, 'moral' package, which rarely starts from an explicit theory of how development takes place . The exception is programmes directly arising from Kohlberg's model, where we can see the dynamic relationship between ontology and advocacy. The emphasis on cognition led to two rather different types of educational programmes. In the 'Socratic' technique, challenges to existing schemas are facilitated through discussion and opportunities for reflection - mainly in a classroom context. Much more ambitious is the 'just community'. Whereas the Socratic method concentrates almost entirely on individual cognitive processes, the just community takes account of social practices - explicitly, that there is no point trying to stimulate individual cognition if all the behaviour, interactions and institutional structures surrounding the individual enact a lower stage of moral reasoning. The just communities had three agendas; to create a democratic environment, to foster social interaction and reflection that promoted cognitive stimulation, and to make sure that the consequences of the group's decisions were a real experience. I am not aware of any explicitly 'communitarian' education agenda, only of general goals. I therefore start from first principles in writing a blueprint, and in doing so, I shall spell out explicitly how values interweave with assumptions about psychological processes. First, let us recap on the principles for consideration: ~ the theoretical presumption is that **people are social beings who generate meaning through discourse and social interaction**, and through cultural repertoires**, stories and scripts transmitted by social practices and narratives.** It follows that: ~ **the desirable goals are values that will promote engagement with the community, and the transcendence of egoism and narrow instrumentalism; these values foster an individual sense of meaning, and a stable community.** The procedures to attain the goals therefore must harness these social and psychological processes. Five principles of moral education follow: Learning through language and social practice means that values must be institutionalised and enacted as part of everyday life, so that they are experienced as taken for granted through action. Fostering social identity means telling stories and narratives about the community and culture which give meaning to one's self, explanations for why things are as they are, and recognition that these stories and accounts are shared. **Feeling engaged with, and connected to, others means experiencing responsibility and caring,** as giver and receiver**, and making these explicit and normative.** Recognising that institutions and communities have multiple covert and overt agendas, and dealing with these, helps community members understand community processes, and fosters pluralist values **A self-conscious appreciation of the** hermeneutic **processes which generate meaning, gained by awareness of the community's norms, and reflection upon them, their evolution and their function; this makes social processes explicit, and by making them open, facilitates** the conscious **generation of new norms.**

E) Rejecting the NC means we become unfamiliar w/ linguistic analyses, which prevents us from understanding language, and how politics should be conducted. Mral:

Brigitte Mral, professor of Rhetoric at Department of Humanities, Örebro University, May 4 (http://www.krisberedskapsmyndigheten.se/4453.epibrw)

Big events sometimes call for big words. In times of crisis, Swedish politicians are also expected to become skillful rhetoricians, to describe events so that we can understand them and lead us into the future. But Swedes are suspicious of passionate, emotional rhetoric, and sceptical of big words. We are not used to politicians coming out at all odd times of the day to speak to the people. The Prime Minister rarely appears as the interpreter of the Swedish Parliament, or the Swedish people for that matter. We usually judge the American way of handling public language as excessive, emotional and full of religious terms. And this is also why we tend to underestimate the significance of what is said. We do not take it seriously; we consider it ‘mere rhetoric’, or empty content – and usually miss the real meaning and implications. **Our unfamiliarity with linguistic analyses means that we often underestimate the power of images and concepts, especially when they are vague and ambiguous**. A cornerstone of this study is that the speeches, no matter how twisted they sometimes seem to us, express exactly what is meant; they are not ‘mere **rhetoric’**, they are a **[is]** **description of the reality that will determine how politics will be conducted and should be understood.** For if we see the speeches as mere wordy desktop products, we are underestimating the power of constantly repeated assertions and vague but powerful terms and phrases. This ‘war on terrorism’ has seen an accumulation of ambiguous but strong value words. There are plenty of ‘God’s terms’ and ‘Devil’s terms’, according to Richard M. Weaver’s modern rhetorical theory.5 He refers to positively and negatively charged words, usually arranged in pairs of opposites: freedom – fear; civilisation – barbarism; war – peace. This ongoing war has generated an abundance of big words and emotionally charged images. Events have been interpreted in value words and metaphors that sometimes remind us of what George Orwell in his gloomy utopia, Nineteen Eighty-Four, refers to as ‘Newspeak’, where war becomes peace,attacks becomes ‘pre-emptive defence’, military invasion becomes ‘change of regime’, occupation becomes ‘humanitarian intervention’. This distortion of language is by no means a new phenomenon. Manipulation and lies have always constituted a basic ingredient in warfare. And those in power have always endeavoured to explain and defend complex and controversial decisions with cosmetic euphemisms.The question today, however, should be how democratic communities ought to relate to this deliberate misdirection of public opinion and openly manipulative impact. One response would be to develop our sensitivity to deceptive rhetorical gimmicks and verbal tricks. We do not necessarily need to oppose military action in order to demand straightforward and honest language in a crisis situation. A democratic society is based on rational dialogue. When democratic

# At Perm do both

1] Doesn’t avoid the link – the mere use of the term “domestic” insulates violence against women from state intervention programs and domesticizes the situation – that’s the Rivera evidence.

2] Evaluate this perm from an offense/defense perspective---ANY RISK of a link means you vote NEG

No such thing as zero risk---there is always a chance that the term “domestic” will trigger the impacts---when there is a Counterplan that solves the whole case, you defer to accepting even low probability DA—key to good decisionmaking.

3] Perm doesn’t solve -- the continued use the term domestic violence prevents our ability to communicate effectively, destroying discourse. Louise:

Mary Louise, journalist with the *London Morning Paper*, 4 (http://www.newswithviews.com/guest\_opinion/guest32.htm)

**Doublethink**, or reality control, **involves being aware of truthfulness**, **while at the same time professing carefully devised lies and believing both**, as our so-called leaders aptly demonstrate. **Political language is designed to make lies sound truthful, and to convey the opposite of actual intentions, in order to greatly influence public opinion**. **Politically correct terminology is the invention of a simplified new vocabulary that masks,** distorts, and alters **the true meanings of traditional definitions**. It **limits the range of ideas and emotions that are allowed to be expressed, and causes unnecessary confusion and conflict that restricts understanding, which makes it difficult to communicate rationally and effectively**. Control of language and information is necessary to condition citizens to love their oppressors, appreciate censorship, and tolerate brutality. Freedom is slavery, war is peace, and ignorance is strength. As George Washington said, "In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened." In the words of George Orwell..."Doublethink means the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them." "1984" is his most famous work, in which a surveillant State enforces conformity through constant indoctrination, fear, lies, and punishment. It was out of the chaos of wars that the Party seized control. This novel introduced the concept of Big Brother and Newspeak, the fictional language that is supposed to eclipse Oldspeak (the existing English language), by the year 2050. The notion was to remove politically incorrect ideas in a vocabulary of dichotomies, euphemisms, and abbreviations. By doing so, making nonconformist thoughts a crime and free speech impossible, in a dreary Totalitarian State, where people cannot resist tyranny, and will surrender liberty for security. Not actually used in the book, "doublespeak" is related to "doubletalk" and the apparent combination of doublethink and newspeak. According to Orwell, "Thoughtcrime is the essential crime that contains all others in itself." The Orwellian concept of crimethink means to doubt the principles of Ingsoc, or even consider any thought that questions official state policy. Ingsoc, or English Socialism, is basically a modern political system of Oligarchical Collectivism, that reflects Stalinism with Machiavellian overtones. "Hate Crime" legislation fits right in with the Orwellian scenario, as the thought police patrol our neighborhoods.

4) The alternative solves 100% of the case debate that means you weigh the net benefit to the alternative vs solvency deficits to the alternative. Too bad there are NO solvency deficits which means a risk of offense on why individuals is bad means you negate.

5) They are reading no evidence on this question on why using both words is good or will solve. Err neg on this issue – multiple authors conclude use of the word intimate partner is good and using both words is bad.

# AT perm do the cp

That’s severance which is bad

A] Advocacy skills

B] Fairness

# At Language is FLuid

1. Their argument paralyzes action- we need static conceptions of words in order for communication and to promote change
2. Irrelevant- prefer my evidence on specificity- I’m reading evidence that says right now these are the connotations of X word; they need to read reasons why the connotations of this particular word is fluid.
3. No chance of change- we can predict the future connotations of this word because of historical trends-- my evidence indicates that historically this word was used in this manner -- means that there’s no chance that the connotation will change since it’s stayed the same for like 100 years
4. No warrant- your author is just asserting words could change without any empirical examples—prefer my evidence which indicates this rhetoric is bad and that we have to change it
5. **Just defense- any risk that language is not fluid means you vote neg b/c the alt does the same action as the aff which means the only possible disadvantage comes from using their word**
6. **I o/w on timeframe— it takes decades for words to take on new meanings which means I am the only one that solves for domestic violence and promotes social change in the short term.**
7. **Severance- Yeah reappropriating language that might be great, but that was not the framing in the 1AC. Once it’s out there you can’t take it back- it was still a rhetorical speech act and I am winning reasons why it’s prohibited**

# AT “Not responsible for words in the resolution”

1. It’s a res k- you still have to defend the resolution like every other aff does- just because you don’t like the resolution doesn’t mean you don’t have to affirm
2. You should be prepared to focus in on every single word in the aff advocacy and the resolution --- that is the most unique link to advocacy skills. Kehl and Livingston:

D.G. Kehl and Howard Livingston, English at Arizona State University and Pace University, July 1999 (English Journal 88.6)

Second, **students’** own linguistic vulnerability should be demonstrated in a meaningful and convincing way. How would they react, for example, if while shopping they encounter “vegetarian leather” for plain, cheap vinyl; or “synthetic glass” for plastic; or, in place of down payment, they get “customer capital cost reduction”? Third, they **should be made more sensitive to language and how it works, not just denotation but connotation**, concrete versus abstract terms, specific versus general, adjectives as evaluative projections of a speaker or writer, slanted language, and much more. For example, they can be asked to consider how many times in a year they buy something simply on the persuasive appeal of words rather than on the genuine merits of the product, whether that product is sunglasses, clothes, vehicles, or food. Especially illuminating in developing sensitivity to language are exercises that ask students to distinguish differences in connotation among lists of so-called synonyms. For example, which of the following would they like to be called—and why: boy/girl, lad/lassie, kid, young person, youngster, tyke, juvenile, future citizen, Generation X-er, member of the rising generation? Lively discussions can be conducted on the connotative effects of the language of advertising. For example, why are certain words taboo in advertising, requiring the substitution of euphemisms: not “fat” but “full figured,” not “cheap” but “inexpensive,” not “used car” but “preowned automobile,” not “smell” but “aroma.” (A recent example of doublespeak for “stink” is “exceed the olfactory threshold.”) Fourth, **students should be taught not only to read critically but also to speak and write responsibility** Wasn't’it Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch who noted that **a writer should be prepared to stand cross-examination on every word**? And as for reading critically, perhaps Thomas Carlyle said it best: “If we think of it, all that a university or final highest school can do for us is still but what the first school began doing—teach us to read.” Isn’t that at least a significant part of the English teacher’s job description? Finally, **students should be taught how to “talk back”** by disarming and defusing doublespeak through what Judith Butler calls “counter-appropriation” (or what Hugh Rank has called “intensifying” and “downplaying” in his Doublespeak Schema). Recent communication theory offers further direction for discussing doublespeak in the classroom. For example, even a brilliant, well-organized, and illustrated lecture on language manipulation may have limited success (the doublespeaker would call it “counterproductive”).

1. encourages argument responsibility [read block in word pics good about arg responsibility]
2. interrogating affirmatives rhetorical choices is crucial to advocacy skills.
3. Interrogating the discourse of the resolution is crucial to negative ground- the only other negative ground on this topic is either pacifism or skepticism— word pic ground is key for the neg to have a fighting chance

6. also key to arguments about the public private dichotomy and feminism literature.

# AT “New Word Adopts connotation”

1. This is a solvency argument- they need to be reading SPECIFIC evidence about why our alt will adopt the negative connotation- they have no evidence on this question, they are just reading generics- only my cards talk about what using the word “X” will actually do
2. Not offense- this is not a reason why the PIC doesn’t solve the aff, this is a reason why my net benefit might be non-unique because the alt might potentially link to the criticism- that means you compare strength of link between their discourse to the net benefit and my discourse to the net benefit- they are only winning a tenuous link b/w -- means you prefer the alt.

3] any reason w

you cant legislate fiat the connotations of a word. Yo ucant fiat that people use words in this way..

they cant will that words mean different things.

The connotatiosn that people make are not things that we are in a position to control. We are in a position to control our words and use of wrods given our connotations of words, and its based on social meanings.

They intend there to be good conntoations,but the fact is that there isn’t good connotations.

Meaning of aw ord is not detrmined by what you wished it meant, but what competent users of English think of it.

Connotations are a social phenomenon, you cant wish it away.

So

# AT “Paralyzes Action”

1. No impact- Analysis of discourse is a prerequisite and accesses your offense- it allows for actual policy implementation. Smith and Bell:

Smith and Bell 2K7  
(Philippa Smith is a PhD in discourses in national identity at AUT University in New Zealand, Allan Bell is Allan Bell is Professor of Language & Communication and the Director of the Institute of Culture, Discourse & Communication at Auckland University of Technology, “Unraveling the Web of Discourse Analysis” pg online @ [http://www.aut.ac.nz/resources/research/research\_institutes/ccr/sage\_proofs\_05-devereux-ch-04.pdf]//greenhill-au)

Foucault’s interest in the power play of specific discourses over society has influenced the postmodern connection between language and social structure (Devereux, 2003). This is echoed by Fairclough when referring to discursive practice contributing not just to the reproduction of society (‘social identities, social relationships, systems of knowledge and belief’), but also to the transformation of society (1992: 65). **Analysis of texts** also **enables** identification of the representation, identity and stereotyping of groups and individuals. It allows for **critical analysis, an awareness of persuasive language, and uncovers dominating social powers behind discourses. Such critical analysis** might not solve problems, but it **is a prerequisite that has the ability to identify and analyze situations, and perhaps suggest ways of alleviating or resolving them** (Fairclough et al., 2004). The **New Zealand** Government, for example, **recognized that promotional texts used by tobacco companies carried** tempting lifestyle **messages to influence**, particularly**, young people’s behaviour and their attitudes towards smoking. As a result, tobacco and advertising sponsorships were banned in the 1990s** (Health NZ, 2005). **A burgeoning of text types in society, largely brought about through developing technologies, compels researchers to seek understanding of social reality through analyzing the discourse of the texts and questioning them**. Legal documents, advertisements, political and Government papers, company newsletters, propaganda leaflets, articles in newspapers, magazines, and books, television, radio and film, music and lyrics, performing arts and more recently the Internet, mobile phones, mobile television and computer games: these are just some examples of the proliferation of texts. Added to this are the changing and merging of existing discourses through processes of globalization of discourses and discourse genres (Fairclough, 2001).

O/w’s your offense- I have specific empirical examples of how discourse successfully changed policy- your claims that discourse paralyzes policy are spurious and not grounded in empirical evidence

2. This argument just concedes my terminal impact- causing real social change doesn’t matter if the discourse that shapes it leads to worse impacts- that means paralysis is a good thing because we’re not shaping policy in a negative way

1. No impact- my advocacy requires the replacement of a word- no reason why that would cause any kind of backup or clogging
2. No impact- I read specific solvency evidence that says the replacement of this word works – also, multiple authors in the topic literature have adopted the alt in their books—that’s where I cut my evidence

# AT “Censorship”

Just b/c they create a group does not mean they

Advocacy skills are whats necessary to stop the impact. If his link argument is true, that there wont be ustainable ag or mass starvation b/c we would have a coalition on how to address that.

Advocacy skills solves that.

1] not banning the word --- not saying that you cant say but we need to reframe what domestic violence entails.

The neg is the political discussion that bleaker saying and silencing it with hteoyr is what silences it. Not the other way around.

We should ban words only if it leads to bad words….

The Spanish inquisition example doesn’t apply –b/c that was grounded on unwarranted reasons to remove people… so long as we have good reasons to ban words, we should do so.

You have to get ride of bad words to get rid of bad impacts.

# AT “Confronting bad words is key to change”

1] if I hadn’t read the word pic, then you wouldn’t have been able to confront the word pic. Therefore, vote for me b/c I am the one who is confronting it.

2] and no one else would be confronting it if I didn’t read it.

No link --- difference between confronting and using it. 🡪 they are using the term domestic violence. If I hadn’t read the word pic, … confronting it is examining that its bad.

This licenses using bad words. .. it doesn’t mean that people should use bad words for no reason.

Alright so are you saying that if discourse doesn’t shape reality, then its permissible to use racial slurs.

# AT Intimate Partner excludes child abuse

# AT Intimate partner excludes other kinds of abuse

1] Your arguments doesn’t solve for abuse --- if I win that the use of “domestic” entrenches the public/private dichotomy – that means interventions programs will inevitably fail. So, even if we include other members of the family it’s irrelevant because they are still insulated from the law. – that means my argument is a prerequisite.

2] Non-unique : you exclude groups too --- domestic is heteronormative and excludes LGBT groups. And that level of exclusion comes first a] discrimination based on sexual orientation is arbitrary

entrenches the public/private dichotomy --- then that serves as a prerequisite to your argument.

# AT “definition no link”

1] You don’t understand how word pics function. Its about connotation not denotation. I can concede this arg b/c it has no impact on connotation argument.

2] definition inclusive not exclusive --- it does not mean that th term domestic violence does not have negative implications.

3] you cant fiat the connotations of your word --- you can say DV refers to x in the world. But that doesn’t mean it has the connotations I’m talking about. And the connotations are the link b/c if everyone internalized the resolution and believed it was permissible, then it results it bad consequences.

# Link Ext Ev

“jana l. jasinki “partner violence : a comprehensive review of 20 years of research”

the temr intimate partner violence good

Part of the literature review process involved in preparing these chapters included reaching agreement on terminology to be used. We chose to use the term partner violence when referring to violence between two married or cohabiting adults. Although the term domestic violence is often used to refer to this phenomenon, we agreed that partner violence more accurately captured the literature we wanted to review. Domestic violence may generally refer to other types of violence in the family, including child abuse. Another commonly used term, marital or spousal violence, implies consideration of only the violence that occurs between married individuals. **Partner violence**, though, **takes into account violence in** **nonmarital relationships, such as cohabiting relationships**. Although this book focus on partner violence and we had much literature to review on this topic, we come from a longstanding tradition of examining violence in the context of the entire family and anticipate that future efforts in this area will integrate discussions of partner violence, child abuse, and sibling violence.

The term domestic violence insulates violence against women from state intervention programs and the law.

Jenny Rivera [Princeton University]"Domestic Violence Against Latinas by Latino Males" FD

**The term “domestic violence” is a misnomer** because it **suggests that violence that occurs in the home or among family members belong in a different category than other forms of violence, or is of a distinctly private nature**. Historically, **such beliefs have acted to insulate violence against women from state intervention and from rigorous law enforcement and judicial scrutiny**. I have avoided use of this term except to the extent necessary for purposes of discussion.

For many years **the police response to** allegations of **domestic violence was** insensitive, **ineffective**, and unprofessional. **There was a significant under-reporting of incidents and a failure by police to recognize** and understand **the issues**. It is fair to say that **the attitude of police officers was a reflection of society** in general, **where domestic-violence victims were not seen as real victims of crime**. **‘Domestics’ were seen as jus**t arguments and **disagreements between couples**, something **that went on behind closed doors and did not** really **affect the** general **public**. **The term ‘just a domestic’** was a well used one **in policing** and **led to the minimizing of the seriousness of domestic-violence incidents**. It is wroth remembering that it was only in 1992 that the House of Lords ruled that there was no longer a rule of law that wife was deemed to have consented permanently to sexual intercourse with her husband; therefore, a husband could be convicted of rape or attempted rape of hi wife where she had withdrawn her consent to sexual intercourse (r v R ]1992 1 AC 599 hl.

Isabel marcus, “reframing domestic violence: terrorism in the home in Martha fineman and Roxanne mykitiuk . the public nature of private violence: the discovery of domestic abuse.

“the hiddgen gender of law” --- regina graycar and jenny morgan. – DV trivializes the violence which broadly is occurring in the context of the home.

Judge said doesn’t like the term b/c it dsiguises its criminal nature. “bromfield v r (unreported, supreme court of western Australia, parker j, 5 december 2002) p 45

# \*\*Theory\*\*

# Word PICS good

C/I: The neg may read one [list status of cp] word PIC that is textually competitive w/ at least one net benefit supported by evidence from a scholar in the relevant field of literature, and the negative may only PIC out of a word in the resolution that has literature from a scholar in the relevant field.

I meet

Net Benefits

A] It demands a rigorous defense of each step of the affirmative’s argumentation that forces in-depth discussion. This is important because when taken to their logical extremes, a painfully in-depth discussion of one issue is more valuable than single sentences covering a thousand topics.

[Breadth inevitable over the course of multiple debates. Only chance for in depth discussion is an individual debate round]

B] Only words PICs force debaters to talk about specific words – two impacts 1] we become more tolerant of words used, which is crucial to a good understanding of our language and the knowledge when to use certain words and not others. 2] teaches us how to persuade people to adopt our advocacies and use the right words in context, which is crucial to advocacy skills because it helps us arrive at the optimal decision --- good advocacy skills only portable skill we learn from debate – ensures we have a defense ouf our language and help create social change.

C] Incentivizes Research – requires all debaters to critically analyze the implications of their arguments as well as inform themselves through research on common lines of thinking that criticize those assumptions. And, even if debaters don’t read the word PIC often, the threat of debaters reading it encourages research.

And not a voting issue.

Your deterrence arguments are false. Two warrants:

A) Threat of punishment encourages debaters to defend the theoretical legitimacy of their position and make it a reverse voting issue. It’s easy to get good at theory and defend a rule.

B) No internal link between dropping the debater and deterrence. Losing an argument is a sufficient deterrent to running abusive arguments – debaters will stop reading arguments that don’t win.

And, dropping debater bad for education.

A) Encourages theory whenever you can’t respond to a sick ass strategy. Sets a precedent to avoid research and plan out strategies to get a link to a violation.

B) Encourages debaters to go all in on theory --- prevents topical debates which are more educational b/c it’s more relevant to our everyday lives.

# Word PICS Good 2NR

The aff does not have a terminal impact --- the ultimate goal in debate is to hone decision making skills that can be used when we leave the activity --- word PICs ensure we put the affs advocacy to scrutiny and arrive at the optimal decision – this practice teaches us the portable skill to have a robust defense of the wording of our advocacies and helps build coalitions through the language we use. That form of advocacy skills prepares us to persuasively create social and political reform and ultimately enables us to solve domestic violence when we leave the activity.

Word PICs are crucial to optimal decision making – it ensures we evaluate and compare the words in the affs advocacy and refine them – creates better advocacy skills.

A] You should be prepared to focus in on every single word in the aff advocacy and the resolution --- that is the most unique link to advocacy skills. Kehl and Livingston:

D.G. Kehl and Howard Livingston, English at Arizona State University and Pace University, July 1999 (English Journal 88.6)

Second, **students’** own linguistic vulnerability should be demonstrated in a meaningful and convincing way. How would they react, for example, if while shopping they encounter “vegetarian leather” for plain, cheap vinyl; or “synthetic glass” for plastic; or, in place of down payment, they get “customer capital cost reduction”? Third, they **should be made more sensitive to language and how it works, not just denotation but connotation**, concrete versus abstract terms, specific versus general, adjectives as evaluative projections of a speaker or writer, slanted language, and much more. For example, they can be asked to consider how many times in a year they buy something simply on the persuasive appeal of words rather than on the genuine merits of the product, whether that product is sunglasses, clothes, vehicles, or food. Especially illuminating in developing sensitivity to language are exercises that ask students to distinguish differences in connotation among lists of so-called synonyms. For example, which of the following would they like to be called—and why: boy/girl, lad/lassie, kid, young person, youngster, tyke, juvenile, future citizen, Generation X-er, member of the rising generation? Lively discussions can be conducted on the connotative effects of the language of advertising. For example, why are certain words taboo in advertising, requiring the substitution of euphemisms: not “fat” but “full figured,” not “cheap” but “inexpensive,” not “used car” but “preowned automobile,” not “smell” but “aroma.” (A recent example of doublespeak for “stink” is “exceed the olfactory threshold.”) Fourth, **students should be taught not only to read critically but also to speak and write re responsibility** Wasn't’it Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch who noted that **a writer should be prepared to stand cross-examination on every word**? And as for reading critically, perhaps Thomas Carlyle said it best: “If we think of it, all that a university or final highest school can do for us is still but what the first school began doing—teach us to read.” Isn’t that at least a significant part of the English teacher’s job description? Finally, **students should be taught how to “talk back”** by disarming and defusing doublespeak through what Judith Butler calls “counter-appropriation” (or what Hugh Rank has called “intensifying” and “downplaying” in his Doublespeak Schema). Recent communication theory offers further direction for discussing doublespeak in the classroom. For example, even a brilliant, well-organized, and illustrated lecture on language manipulation may have limited success (the doublespeaker would call it “counterproductive”).

And, this means the word PIC is uniquely predictable b/c students should be able to defend every word they speak.

B] The language we use shapes our reality --- effects our ability to create constructive discourse --- connotations of domestic violence is crucial to solve abuse and ensure victims are protected. Fountain et al -

Kim Fountain et al [PH.D, Deputy Director New York City Anti-Violence Project], "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer Domestic violence in the united states in 2008" The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs www.avp.org/documents/2008NCAVPLGBTQDVReportFINAL.pdf FD

Definitions are important because without a clear understanding of what domestic violence is, it can be difficult for survivors to determine if they are experiencing domestic violence. **Providers who do not share a definition of domestic violence may refuse to recognize this violence in LGBTQ relationships and opt to deny services**. Further, **without a nuanced understanding of the unique aspects of LGBTQ domestic violence, providers may choose to adopt a „one size fits all‟ mentality where they claim to deliver services to all equally when LGBTQ survivors are not actually receiving culturally competent or equal services**. Despite dilemmas regarding definitions, **they are important as they help to frame and name acts of violence and to hold perpetrators of such violence accountable**.

B] The language we use shapes our reality --- effects our ability to create constructive discourse --- serves as a prerequisite to taking action and is crucial to actually help victims in need.

Smith and Bell:

Phillipa Smith and Alan Bell [Philippa Smith is a PhD in discourses in national identity at AUT University in New Zealand, Allan Bell is Allan Bell is Professor of Language & Communication and the Director of the Institute of Culture, Discourse & Communication at Auckland University of Technology], “Unraveling the Web of Discourse Analysis” <http://www.aut.ac.nz/resources/research/research_institutes/ccr/sage_proofs_05-devereux-ch-04.pdf>

Foucault’s interest in the power play of specific discourses over society has influenced the postmodern connection between language and social structure (Devereux, 2003). This is echoed by Fairclough when referring to discursive practice contributing not just to the reproduction of society (‘social identities, social relationships, systems of knowledge and belief’), but also to the transformation of society (1992: 65). **Analysis of texts also enables identification of the representation, identity and stereotyping of groups and individuals. It allows for critical analysis, an awareness of persuasive language, and uncovers dominating social powers behind discourses.** Such critical analysis **[this] might not solve problems**, **but** it **is a prerequisite that has the ability to identify and analyze situations, and perhaps suggest ways of alleviating or resolving them** (Fairclough et al., 2004). The New Zealand Government, for example, recognized that promotional texts used by tobacco companies carried tempting lifestyle messages to influence, particularly, young people’s behaviour and their attitudes towards smoking. As a result, tobacco and advertising sponsorships were banned in the 1990s (Health NZ, 2005). A burgeoning of text types in society, largely brought about through developing technologies, compels researchers to seek understanding of social reality through analyzing the discourse of the texts and questioning them. Legal documents, advertisements, political and Government papers, company newsletters, propaganda leaflets, articles in newspapers, magazines, and books, television, radio and film, music and lyrics, performing arts and more recently the Internet, mobile phones, mobile television and computer games: these are just some examples of the proliferation of texts. Added to this are the changing and merging of existing discourses through processes of globalization of discourses and discourse genres (Fairclough, 2001).

That means I have the strongest and most unique link to advocacy skills.

I will now do two things. First, explain how you have no unique offense linking to any terminal impact. And second, kick your ass on the impact debate.

A2 Ground loss

1) Begs the question of what you should be researching. The reason you don’t have ground is because you haven’t researched the topic right. If I win any of my arguments about why a focus on words is good that turns your ground argument.

2) Newsflash buddy: you are not entitled to whatever ground you want.

3) The standard should not be ground skew but the quality of ground on both sides of my position. The ground is equally good. You have access to any of the following arguments a) discourse arguments why the word victim is good b) the word survivor is bad c) victim is key to promote sympathy and cause change.

A2 predictability

1] CI solves --- you should be required to research words b/c its published. My solvency advocate is not from a blog but has a PHD in law and sociology.

Saying its unpredictable b/c you don’t have answers doesn’t make sense. They are not providing you with the criterion for how we determine whether something is predictable. Only way to do this is what is the research norm. My arguments are consistent with the research norm so solves your predictability arguments.

2] All your internal links are inevitable --- judges you have seen before are unpredictable, new strategies are unpredictable, etc.

A2 Education

1] I solve education -- Their generic impact of education is not unique to debate. we can learn about DV by doing a presentation on it or gong to a woman’s shelter, but talking about the effects of particular words hones your decision-making skills by making you more persuasive.

2] only my impact is a prerequisite --- only reason why education is useful is if you can be persuasive and spread education, which severs their internal link to ground.

IMPACT DEBATE

\*\*Even if they win that word PICs are unfair and bad for debate, debaters need to learn the dark arts on how to defeat these kinds of positions. Inevitably when we leave the activity, we are going to be faced with unpredictable arguments that are challenging and that we haven’t predicted. We can’t whine and say “its unpredictable or strat skew” we are going to have to stand up and respond!

Advocacy skills comes first

A] Abuse inevitable in debates and in life. You will always be faced up against good strategies that make it hard to win, teams with more resources, people who are faster than you. Advocacy skills is the only unique external impact.

B] Fairness is silly b/c things will always be unfair. No learning if you ground your decisions on fairness.

C] Not unique to debate -- If you want a fair activity, go play board games. As a judge you should only evaluate what is the better model of debate.

D] Not a voting issue – their inability to handle a good strategy doesn’t mean you should drop me.

E] All their fairness argument assume a world where I am abusing the team reading things not specific to the aff or the resolution – but this is different.

My impact outweighs your impact

A] Encourages a unique skillset. It teaches debaters how to make the best kind of decisions and weigh the advantages and disadvantages of taking an action.

B] Promotes a portable skill that debaters will value once they leave the activity. Advocacy skills is crucial to becoming a good lawyer, interviewing for jobs, or even persuading people in general by knowing what are the merits and disadvantages of a particular action.

C] The thesis of the Iraq war was grounded in flawed advocacy skills – bush did not have to defend his policies against people on the far left, which allowed for massive atrocities and the death of thousands. Only my model of debate encourages debaters to make the optimal decision and avoids bad shit from happening in the real world with flawed advocates.

# AT “interp you can critique affs discourse but cant solve aff”

A2 critique affs discourse but don’t steal the aff

1] opportunity costs to doing the affirmative ----

2] doesn’t solve b/c there is a focus on other external disadvantages --- which decreases emphasis on the focus of words.

3] solving the aff is crucial to making the aff a moot point --- centering the debate on the pic

4] doesn’t solve --- critical reflection is useless and doesn’t help create coalitions and social change.. alternative words are crucial b/c it helps guide movements, etc.

5] doesn’t place importance in the discourse ---

doesn’t give you advocacy skills
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